

## **REMARKS**

In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and withdraw them.

### **Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)**

Claims 1, 15-16, 35, 47, 50, 65, 78, 92-93, and 112 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,633,723 to Sugiyama in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,884,056 to Steele. This rejection is now traversed.

Representative claim 1, as amended, recites:

A multifunction printer for printing time-based media, the multifunction printer comprising:

a communication interface for receiving time-based media data from a media source;

a processor within the multifunction printer for performing a user-selected multimedia function on the time-based media data and for generating a printable representation comprising results of the user-selected multimedia function applied to the time-based media;

a user interface display on the multifunction printer that displays a function selection menu comprising a plurality of user-selectable audio range selection functions and a plurality of user-selectable video range selection functions to be applied to the time-based media by the processor;

an input device for receiving from the user a selection of the multimedia function from the plurality of user-selectable video range selection functions and the plurality of user-selectable audio range selection functions displayed on the function selection menu;

a first output device for receiving the printable representation from the processor and for automatically printing the printable representation to a tangible medium; and

a second output device coupled to the processor for receiving the printable representation from the processor and for outputting an electronic output including the printable representation.

The claimed invention includes a user interface display on a multifunction printer that allows a user to select from a plurality of user-selectable audio range selection functions and a plurality of user-selectable video range selection functions. The printer performs the user-selected multimedia function and is capable of producing both printed and electronic outputs.

None of the cited references disclose or suggest at least the limitation:

“...a user interface display on the multifunction printer that displays a function selection menu comprising a plurality of user-selectable audio range selection functions and a plurality of user-selectable video range selection functions.”

Sugiyama merely discloses a video printer that allows a user viewing a video to select frames for printing. In order to print an image, the user selects a memory key 21 to freeze a displayed image and then initiates printing with a print key 23. *See* Sugiyama, col. 4, ll. 45-54. Instead of a utilizing a user interface display as claimed, the printer of Sugiyama includes an assortment of input keys operable by the user. For example, Sugiyama includes a memory key 21, a memory delete key 22, a print key 23, a group of conditioning keys 24, and a group of character input keys 25, which provide various memory functions such as, for example, storing a frame of video to a memory or deleting a frame of video from memory. *See* Sugiyama col. 3, ll. 42-50. Sugiyama includes a monitor 20, but this monitor 20 is only for displaying selected video frames and is not a user interface display that displays any menu. Thus, Sugiyama fails to disclose or suggest a user interface display on a multifunction printer that displays a function selection menu as claimed.

Sugiyama furthermore fails to disclose or suggest that such a selection menu, if it existed, would comprise “a plurality of user-selectable audio range selection

functions and a plurality of user-selectable video range selection functions.” At best, Sugiyama provides functions for selecting and manipulating frames of video for printing. *See, e.g.*, Sugiyama, col. 5 ll. 2-11 (arranging selected frames in a 2 x 2 matrix). Sugiyama does not disclose or suggest that the printer is capable of applying any audio range selection function, nor does Sugiyama display any menu on a user interface display that includes a plurality of user-selectable audio range selection functions.

Steele fails to remedy the deficiencies of Sugiyama set forth above. Rather, Steele merely discloses a system for video browsing on the World Wide Web using thumbnails corresponding to video images. By selecting a pair of the thumbnails, a new set of thumbnails is generated. The new set of thumbnails comprises frames of the video that are temporally located between the selected pair, allowing the user to narrow the time frame of thumbnails being viewed. *See* Steele, col. 3, l. 57 to col. 4, l. 21. Like Sugiyama, Steele fails to disclose or suggest any user interface display on a multifunction printer that displays a function selection menu. Rather, Steele is not directed to a printer at all. Furthermore, Steele’s user interface does not display any menu that allows the user to select any specific function from a plurality of selectable functions. Furthermore, like Sugiyama, Steele is directed only to applying a video-based thumbnail selection and fails to disclose or suggest displaying a menu that includes any user-selectable audio range selection functions.

The Examiner suggests combining the video printer of Sugiyama to include the video processing elements of Steele. However, the suggested combination still fails to yield **a user interface display on a multifunction printer**. Furthermore, the

suggested combination would still fail to yield **a function selection menu comprising a plurality of user-selectable video range selection functions and a plurality of user-selectable audio range selection functions**. Therefore, the claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references taken alone or in the suggested combination.

Claim 78 is patentable over Sugiyama and Steele for at least the same reasons as above. As claims 15-16, 35, 47, 50, 65, 78, 92-93, 112-123 depend from claim 1 or 78, all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 1 and 78 also apply to claims 15-16, 35, 47, 50, 65, 78, 92-93 and 112-123. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 15-16, 35, 47, 50, 65, 78, 92-93 and 112-123 are also patentable over Steele and Sugiyama for at least the same reasons recited above.

In the 4<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> paragraphs of the Office Action, the remaining dependent claims have further been rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Steele and Sugiyama in various combinations with U.S. Patent No. 6,118,888 to Chino; U.S. Patent No. 5,091,948 to Kametani; U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0101513 A1 to Halverson; U.S. Patent No. 6,611,622 B1 to Krumm; U.S. Patent No. 6,594,377 B1 To Kim; U.S. Patent No. 5,568,406 to Gerber; U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0220988 A1 to Hymel; U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0010641 A1 to Stevens; U.S. Patent No. 6,296,693 B1 to McCarthy; U.S. Patent No. 5,115,967 to Wedekind; U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0003846 A1 to Rowe; and U.S. Patent No. 6,373,498 B1 to Abgrall.

The cited references each do not disclose or suggest all of the claimed limitations previously discussed, nor does the Examiner argue that they do. Rather

these references are cited for various aspects present in the respective dependent claims. Furthermore, the dependent claims recite additional elements that also are patentably distinguishable from all cited combinations of the above references. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections to the remaining dependent claims and withdraw them.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the above Amendments and Remarks Applicants submit that claims 1-112 are patentable over the cited references. Applicants request reconsideration of the rejections to the claims and request allowance of them. In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,  
Peter E. Hart *et al.*

Date: \_\_August 1, 2008\_\_

By: /Jason E. Amsel/  
Jason E. Amsel, Patent Agent  
Reg. No. 60,650  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
Silicon Valley Center  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Phone: (650) 335-7692  
Fax: (650) 938-5200